

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

United States of America,  
Plaintiff,

No. 2:20-cr-00150-KJM-1

v.  
Ronald Steven Schoenfeld,  
Defendant.

United States of America,  
Plaintiff,

No. 2:21-mc-00076-KJM-DB

v.  
Ronald Steven Schoenfeld,  
Defendant.

United States of America,  
Plaintiff,

No. 2:21-mc-00077-KJM-DB

v.  
Ronald Steven Schoenfeld,  
Defendant.

1           United States of America,

2                 Plaintiff,

3                 v.

4           Ronald Steven Schoenfeld,

5                 Defendant.

6

7

8

9           United States of America,

10                 Plaintiff,

11                 v.

12           Ronald Steven Schoenfeld,

13                 Defendant.

14

15           United States of America,

16                 Plaintiff,

17                 v.

18           Ronald Steven Schoenfeld,

19                 Defendant.

20

21

22

23           United States of America,

24                 Plaintiff,

25                 v.

26           Ronald Steven Schoenfeld,

27                 Defendant.

28

No. 2:21-mc-00078-KJM-DB

No. 2:21-mc-00079-KJM-DB

No. 2:21-mc-00080-KJM-DB

No. 2:21-mc-00081-KJM-DB

1 \_\_\_\_\_  
2 United States of America,

No. 2:21-mc-00082-KJM-DB

3 Plaintiff,

4 v.

5 Ronald Steven Schoenfeld,

6 Defendant.  
7 \_\_\_\_\_

8 United States of America,

No. 2:21-mc-00083-KJM-DB

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 Ronald Steven Schoenfeld,

12 Defendant.  
13 \_\_\_\_\_

14 United States of America,

No. 2:21-mc-00095-KJM-DB

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 Ronald Steven Schoenfeld,

18 Defendant.  
19 \_\_\_\_\_

20 United States of America,

No. 2:21-mc-00096-KJM-DB

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 Ronald Steven Schoenfeld,

24 Defendant.  
25 \_\_\_\_\_

**RELATED CASE ORDER**

1           Examination of the above-captioned actions reveals that they are related within the  
2 meaning of Local Rule 123(a). Here, “[all] actions involve similar questions of fact and the same  
3 question of law and their assignment to the same Judge or Magistrate Judge is likely to effect a  
4 substantial savings of judicial effort.” Local Rule 123(a)(3). Accordingly, the assignment of  
5 these matters to the same judge is likely to effect a substantial savings of judicial effort and is  
6 likely to be convenient for the parties.

7           The parties should be aware that relating cases under Rule 123 causes the actions  
8 to be assigned to the same judge—it does not consolidate the actions. Under Rule 123, related  
9 cases are generally assigned to the judge and magistrate judge to whom the first filed action was  
10 assigned.

11           As a result, it is hereby ORDERED that 2:21-mc-00076-KJM-DB; 2:21-mc-  
12 00077-KJM-DB; 2:21-mc-00078-KJM-DB; 2:21-mc-00080-KJM-DB; 2:21-mc-00081-KJM-DB;  
13 2:21-mc-00082-KJM-DB; 2:21-mc-00083-KJM-DB; 2:21-mc-00095-KJM-DB; 2:21-mc-00096-  
14 KJM-DB are related and remain assigned to the undersigned and Magistrate Judge Deborah  
15 Barnes.

16           IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 DATED: April 13, 2021.

18   
19 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28